BEFORE THE SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON

1 IN THE MATTER OF A SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT ISSUED BY 2 LEWIS COUNTY TO JACK G. BATY SHB No. 97 3 JACK G. BATY, FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 4 Appellant, AND ORDER 5 vs. 6 LEWIS COUNTY, 7 Respondent. 8

THIS MATTER being a request for review for a recreational subdivision; having come on regularly for hearing before the Shorelines Hearings Board on the 17th day of December, 1973, at Chehalis, Washington; and appellant Jack G. Baty appearing through his attorney, Laurel L. Tiller and respondent Lewis County appearing through its deputy prosecuting attorney, Norm Stough; and Board members present at the hearing being W. A. Gissberg (presiding), Ralph A. Beswick, Walt Woodward, Mary Ellen McCaffree and Robert Beaty; and the Board having considered the sworn testimony, exhibits, records and files herein and having entered on the 27th day of March, 1974, its proposed Findings of Fact,

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1	Conclusions of Law and Order, and the Board having served said proposed
2	Findings, Conclusions and Order upon all parties herein by certified
3	mail, return receipt requested and all parties having submitted a
4	Waiver of Exception and Written Argument and Request for Final Order, and
5	The Board being fully advised in the premises; now therefore,
6	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said proposed
7	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, dated the 27th day of
8	March, 1974, and incorporated by this reference herein and attached
9	hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as the Board's Final
10	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order herein.
11	DONE at Lacey, Washington, this 26 day of April , 1974.
12	SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
13	New 1 1
14	Nalt Noodward
15	WALL WOODWARD, CHallylan
16	All Thin like
17	W. A. GISSBERG, Member
18	
19	MARY ELLAN McCAFFREE, Member
20	
21	
22	RALPH A. BESWICK, Member
23	
24	
25	

16 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,CONCLUSIONS OF LAW27 AND ORDER

BEFORE THE 1 SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE MATTER OF A SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT ISSUED BY LEWIS COUNTY TO JACK G. BATY JACK G. BATY, SHB No. 97 5 Appellant, FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 7 vs. LEWIS COUNTY, 8 Respondent. 9 10

This matter having come on for hearing on December 17, 1973 in Chehalis, Washington before Board members W. A. Gissberg (presiding), Ralph A. Beswick, Walt Woodward, Mary Ellen McCaffree and Robert Beaty, appellant appearing personally and through his attorneys, Dysart, Moore, Tiller & Murray, Laurel L. Tiller of counsel; and Lewis County appearing 16 by and through its deputy prosecuting attorney, Norm Stough, and the Board having heard the testimony and considered the evidence and being 18 fully advised makes the following

EXHIBIT A

11

12

13

15

FINDINGS OF FACT

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

On July 2, 1973 Lewis County issued a substantial development permit to Jack G. Baty for a recreational subdivision as to real estate more particularly described in the application of appellant which is a part of this cause.

II.

On July 27, 1973 the appellant appealed from a portion of that permit. that portion being the following requirement:

> "All road construction shall comply to minimum standards for road construction as set forth by the Lewis County Engineer and also found in the Lewis County Subdivision Resolution dated March 26, 1962 as revised August 9, 1971, Article 5, Section 5.01 thru 5.23."

> > III.

On August 28, 1973 the office of the attorney general of the State of Washington certified the appellant's request for review as being a reasonable one.

IV.

Appellant does have a Department of Ecology permit for a recreational subdivision in a flood plain by Permit No. 2-1302. The property is not within the floodway of the flood plain. Purchasers of the lots will not be required to procure a shoreline management permit nor a flood plain control zone permit for the construction of a single family residence.

ν.

The appellant's proposed recreational subdivision seeks to retain as much as possible of the natural conditions of the shorelines of the

1 |state as is consistent with providing access to the tracts or lots within the subdivision. VI. 3 The Lewis County subdivision ordinance is essentially designed to 4 lay down certain mandatory requirements which are applicable in the case of more intense land development. By its terms, the subdivision ordinance expressly excludes from its coverage the division of land where each parcel is five acres or more in area. 8 VII. 9 Each parcel of land within appellant's proposed plat is five acres or 10 more in area. 11 VIII. 12 13 There was no evidence presented at the hearing relating to the status of the master program of Lewis County. 14 15 From which comes the following 16 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW I. 17 This Board has jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter of 18 19 the review. II. 20 The substantial development shoreline management permit, as ordered 21 modified by this Board, is consistent with the policy of the Shoreline 22 Management Act, the Guidelines of the Department of Ecology and, insofar 23 as can be ascertained, the master program of Lewis County. 24 III. 25 The matter should be remanded to Lewis County for the reissuance of FINDINGS OF FACT,

3

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

AND ORDER

6. 7. No 1025-A-

a	permit	in	accordance	with	the	following:
---	--------	----	------------	------	-----	------------

- The requirement mentioned in paragraph II of these Findings of Fact shall be stricken.
- 2) All roads within the subdivision shall be "all weather" roads typical to those utilized in the surrounding area and used for recreational forest access.
- 3) The travel surface of such roads shall be not less than 16 feet in width with ditching where necessary.
- 4) The construction of any road whose grade is in excess of ten percent shall be subject to erosion control measures and requirements to be first approved by the Lewis County Engineer.
- to the roads and the lots or subdivisions as now laid out and described on Appellant's Exhibit 3. The permit should contain a specific legal description confining the substantial development permit to the area of Appellant's Exhibit 3 showing lots and subdivisions thereon together with road access thereto.
- 6) No roads shall be constructed within 200 feet of the Cowlitz River and Otter Creek, except as otherwise shown on Appellant's Exhibit 3. This condition should be expressed by description upon the permit.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

There are two areas in the subdivision in which 7) 1 the proposed roadway grade exceeds the maximum 2 allowable grade percentage contained in the Lewis 3 Those areas shall County subdivision regulations. be finished by appellant in a double oil mat surface. Area B of Exhibit 3 shall also be so finished, if 6 in the opinion of the Lewis County Engineer such 7 is desirable or necessary for road travel. 8 9 ORDER The permit is remanded to Lewis County to reissue the permit in 10 accordance with the Conclusions of Law expressed herein and in such form 11 as shall expressly and definitively state thereon the conditions under 12 13 which the substantial development may proceed. DATED this 27th day of March 14 SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 ROBERT BEATY, Member 23 24 25

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER